arXiv:1204.3571v1 [quant-ph] 16 Apr 2012

Exchange Fluctuation Theorem for correlated quantum systems

David Jennings and Terry Rudolph
Controlled Quantum Dynamics Theory Group, Level 12, EEE,
Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

Yuji Hirono, Shojun Nakayama, and Mio Murao
Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, Hongo 7-3-1 Bunkyo-ku Toyko 113-0033, Japan

(Dated: March 2, 2013)

We extend the Exchange Fluctuation Theorem for energy exchange between thermal quantum systems beyond the assumption of molecular chaos, and describe the non-equilibrium exchange dynamics of correlated quantum states. The relation quantifies how the tendency for systems to equilibrate is modified in high-correlation environments. Our results elucidate the role of measurement disturbance for such scenarios. We show a simple application by finding a semi-classical maximum work theorem in the presence of correlations.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Mn, 05.70.Ln

Fluctuation theorems describe non-equilibrium transformations of thermodynamic systems and constitute a refinement of the second law of thermodynamics, the most well-known incarnations being the work fluctuation theorems due to Jarzynski and Crooks [1–3]. However, in addition to focussing on the extraction of mechanical work from a single quantum system, an equally fundamental topic is the thermodynamic tendency of multipartite systems to equilibrate. The canonical example of this is heat exchange between two thermal systems at different temperatures and leads us instead to fluctuation theorems for heat that provide a quantitative description of the fluctuations in energy exchange between two hot bodies.

The thermodynamic arrow [5, 6] is one particular manifestation of the second law of thermodynamics, and in its canonical form states that on average, heat will flow from a hotter body to a colder one. Specifically, given two thermal states ρ_A and ρ_B at temperatures T_A and T_B with respect to Hamiltonians H_A and H_B, and an energy-conserving unitary evolution of the joint state, $\rho_A \otimes \rho_B \rightarrow U\rho_A \otimes \rho_B U^\dagger$, we define heat flow into A as $Q_A = \mathrm{tr}[H_A\rho'_A] - \mathrm{tr}[H_A\rho_A]$ where ρ'_A is the final reduced state for A, and we assume that the free Hamiltonians for A and B do not change. The fact that Gibbsian states minimize the free energy yields the inequality

$$Q_A(\frac{1}{T_A} - \frac{1}{T_B}) \geq 0, \tag{1}$$

and so if $T_A < T_B$ we have that the Q_A is strictly positive, and *on average* energy is transferred from the hotter body to the colder one. This is the standard thermodynamic arrow for heat flow.

However, a sharper expression of the directionality for heat flow exists in the recent Exchange Fluctuation Theorem (XFT) due to Jarzynski and Wójcik [4], which states that for two systems A and B, initially at temperatures T_A and T_B, the probability $P(q)$ of a *sharp* exchange of energy q from B to A obeys the relation

$$P(q)/P(-q) = \exp[\Delta\beta q], \tag{2}$$

where $\Delta\beta = (kT_A)^{-1} - (kT_B)^{-1}$. This relation quantifies the relative likelihood of a fixed exchange process and its time reversed twin, and shows that heat flow from a colder to a hotter object is exponentially suppressed. A simple application of Jensen's inequality to (2) leads to an averaged inequality $\langle q\rangle(1/T_A - 1/T_B) \geq 0$. This seems to suggest that (1) automatically follows from (2), however it must be emphasized that while Q_A equals $\langle q\rangle$ for *classical* states, this need not be true for more general quantum mechanical states. In general, a sharp (rank-1 projective) energy measurement will produce non-classical disturbances in the quantum state of a system, and even though the expression $\langle q\rangle(1/T_A - 1/T_B) \geq 0$ still provides a thermodynamic directionality, it is no longer identical to (1), which does not involve any measurement disturbance.

The scope of the XFT is impressive, being valid for arbitrary unitary interactions between A and B that conserve energy, and rests crucially on the two assumptions of (I) initial Gibbsian states, and (II) the assumed time-reversal invariance of the underlying dynamics. However the directionality for the thermodynamic processes relies on the third assumption (III) that the systems involved are initially uncorrelated; namely Boltzmann's assumption of 'molecular chaos' [7]. As such, both the Clausius relation (1) and the Jarzynski-Wójcik Fluctuation Theorem (2) are limited in application, and will fail to hold within the domain of high-correlation environments. Indeed, with the extremal case of a globally pure, multipartite quantum state with thermal subsystems there should exist *no directional constraint* whatsoever, and for such situations no equality such as (2) should hold. The reason for this is that pure quantum states are states of maximal knowledge and may be reversibly interconverted through the appropriate unitary transformations. Such pure state thermality is of importance and turns out to be the *typical* scenario with respect to the Haar measure. Specifically, for a randomly chosen multipartite state $|\Psi\rangle$ of a system with fixed energy, the reduced state for a small subsystem is exponentially likely to be Gibbsian

[10], with the thermality arising due to quantum entanglement.

Quantum correlations can be far stronger than their classical counterparts, and in addition to the Gibbsian typicality in pure states, entanglement theory has other deep connections with thermodynamics [11], often through their parallel formulations as resource theories [12]. Beyond the foundational interest of studying the dissolution of the thermodynamic arrow due to strong correlations, there is also rapid experimental progress in the precise manipulation of small quantum systems designed to function as engines at nanoscales, and as such, it is also of practical importance to determine the fundamental limitations and behaviour of heat exchange in such quantum systems.

The purpose of this letter is to remove the third fundamental assumption (III) of molecular chaos, and extend the existing XFT into high-correlation environments, in which initially correlated quantum systems are allowed to evolve under non-equilbrium dynamics and exchange heat. In doing so we identify the appropriate information-theoretic measure for the effect of correlations on sharp energy exchanges and describe how it may contribute in a maximum work theorem scenario. We also demonstrate the strong constraints that measurement disturbance imposes on the formulation of a more general fluctuation theorem that allows POVM measurements on the systems.

Details of the generalized setting. We wish to establish an exchange fluctuation theorem for a bipartite quantum system, whose reduced states ρ_A and ρ_B are initially thermal, but where we drop the assumption of the initial factorization of the joint state ρ_{AB} and allow genuine quantum mechanical coherence and entanglement to either evolve or be initially present.

In defining heat exchange in [4], the isolated bipartite system is assumed to undergo a three step process, in which an initial energy measurement $\mathcal{M}_1$ is first performed on the two subsystems which are then allowed to subsequently interact and evolve under a unitary U, until a final energy measurement $\mathcal{M}_2$ is performed. Thus, the bipartite quantum state ρ_{AB} undergoes the following sequence of quantum operations: $\rho_{AB} \to \mathcal{M}_1[\rho_{AB}] \to U \circ \mathcal{M}_1[\rho_{AB}] \to \mathcal{M}_2 \circ U \circ \mathcal{M}_1[\rho_{AB}]$.

As mentioned, the central assumptions of the XFT are time-reversal symmetry of the underlying dynamics and the initial thermality of the individual subsystems. Specifically, we assume that $\Theta^\dagger H_A \Theta = H_A$ and $\Theta^\dagger H_B \Theta = H_B$, where Θ is the anti-unitary time-reversal operator. In what follows we use joint energy eigenstates $|\phi,\chi\rangle$, such that $H_A|\phi,\chi\rangle = E_\phi|\phi,\chi\rangle$ and $H_B|\phi,\chi\rangle = E_\chi|\phi,\chi\rangle$, for which we deduce that $H_A\Theta|\phi,\chi\rangle = E_\phi\Theta|\phi,\chi\rangle$ (with a similar expression for B). We take $\{|\phi\rangle\}$ and $\{|\chi\rangle\}$ to be complete orthonormal bases for A and B so that $H_A = \sum_\phi E_\phi|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ and $H_B = \sum_\chi E_\chi|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$, and since Θ is a symmetry of classical states we assume that $\Theta(|\phi\rangle \otimes |\chi\rangle)$ is always in the basis set $\{|\phi\rangle \otimes |\chi\rangle\}$ for any ϕ and χ. The thermal marginal states of ρ_{AB} are then given by $\rho_A = Z_A^{-1}\sum_\phi e^{-\beta_A E_\phi}|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ and $\rho_B = Z_B^{-1}\sum_\chi e^{-\beta_B E_\chi}|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$, where Z_A and Z_B are the usual partition functions for A and B.

The measurements $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ used to determine the energies of the subsystems can in general be POVM measurements, however we restrict both the initial and final measurement to be rank-1 projective measurements onto the local energy eigenbases of A and B; a point we return to later. Given this, it is useful to introduce the notion of a *history* for the composite quantum system AB. A history is denoted

$$\gamma = \Big(\rho_{AB}; |\phi\rangle \otimes |\chi\rangle \xrightarrow{U} |\phi'\rangle \otimes |\chi'\rangle\Big), \tag{3}$$

where ρ_{AB} is the initial quantum state that is first projected into the energy eigenstate $|\phi\rangle \otimes |\chi\rangle$ under $\mathcal{M}_1$ and then evolves unitarily to $U(|\phi\rangle \otimes |\chi\rangle)$, which is then measured and projected into the energy eigenstate $|\phi'\rangle \otimes |\chi'\rangle$ under $\mathcal{M}_2$.

We denote by Γ the full set of all histories $\{\gamma\}$ comprised of first beginning in the state ρ_{AB}, measuring out some energy eigenstate, evolving under some U and then measuring out some final energy eigenstate.

The thermodynamic condition of energy conservation we use is simply that $\mathrm{tr}[\rho_{AB}(H_A + H_B)] = \mathrm{tr}[U\rho_{AB}U^\dagger(H_A + H_B)]$. We note that U involves the interaction Hamiltonian that is assumed to be smoothly switched on and off, but the energies of the subsystems are always measured with respect to their appropriate free Hamiltonian.

While the exchange fluctuation theorem is a refinement on the thermodynamic arrow for heat flow, in that it deals with subensembles of postselected outcomes with sharp energy transfers q, not all of the uncertainty is attributable to the statistical mixture of different energy states. Pure quantum mechanical states allow the possibility of intrinsic quantum fluctuations, and so while we might step beyond classical statistical fluctuations by focussing on individual pure state outcomes in the XFT, we might also allow the possibility of quantum coherence evolving under the unitary dynamics and generating new indeterminacy. For example, with respect to the statistics of energy measurements, the pure quantum state $|\psi\rangle \propto \sum_k \sqrt{e^{-\beta E_k}}|E_k\rangle$ is indistinguishable from a thermal mixed state.

The energy measurement of such superpositions will display quantum fluctuations, some of which may increase the total energy of AB, some decrease it, but on average no net energy should be gained from the fluctuations. It is then simple to allow histories with positive energy fluctuations that increase the total energy of AB, or negative fluctuations that decrease the energy of AB, and also histories with no fluctuations at all. As such, a useful and physically intuitive division of the set of histories is into sets of histories with similar energy transformations. In particular we write $\Gamma = \cup_{q,\Delta\epsilon}\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)$, where $\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)$ is the set of γ (of the form (3)) with fluctuations of the total energy of AB

$$\Delta\epsilon = \langle\phi',\chi'|(H_A+H_B)|\phi',\chi'\rangle - \langle\phi,\chi|(H_A+H_B)|\phi,\chi\rangle,$$

and with an energy transfer q into A defined as $q = \langle\phi'|H_A|\phi'\rangle - \langle\phi|H_A|\phi\rangle$.

An XFT for correlated quantum states. Within the setting just described we can now formulate an XFT that drops assumption (III) of molecular chaos.

For an initial state ρ_{AB} the occurrence of a single history $\gamma \in \Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)$, has probability

$$\text{Prob}[\gamma] = \langle\phi,\chi|\rho_{AB}|\phi,\chi\rangle|(|\phi',\chi'\rangle, U|\phi,\chi\rangle)|^2, \qquad (4)$$

where $U \equiv e^{-iHt}$ and $H \equiv H_A + H_B + H_{\text{int}}$ is the total Hamiltonian, including the interaction H_{int} between A and B, which is switched on at the initial time, and for clarity we write the Hilbert space inner product as $(\cdot,\cdot)$.

From time-reversal invariance, $\Theta^\dagger H\Theta = H$, and the anti-unitarity of Θ it follows that $U = \Theta^\dagger U^\dagger\Theta$, and so we have that

$$|(|\phi',\chi'\rangle, U|\phi,\chi\rangle)|^2 \;=\; |(\Theta|\phi,\chi\rangle, U\Theta|\phi',\chi'\rangle)|^2. \quad (5)$$

Thus, time-reversal symmetry alone implies the probability to go from the initial state $|\phi,\chi\rangle$ to $|\phi',\chi'\rangle$ is always equal to the probability to go from $\Theta|\phi',\chi'\rangle$ to $\Theta|\phi,\chi\rangle$ under the same unitary interaction. In what follows, we use a star to denote time-reversed objects, for example $|\phi',\chi'\rangle_* := \Theta|\phi',\chi'\rangle$.

To quantify correlations in the quantum state as they relate to the XFT we define, for any joint local POVMs $\{M_i\}$ on A and $\{N_j\}$ on B, the quantity $\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}; M_i, N_j)$ via the expression

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}; M_i, N_j) \;:=\; \ln\left(\frac{\text{tr}[M_i\otimes N_j\rho_{AB}]}{(\text{tr}[M_i\rho_A]\text{tr}[N_j\rho_B])}\right). \quad (6)$$

For a sharp enery measurement, we simply have $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{M_\phi \otimes N_\chi\}$ where $\{M_\phi = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|\}$ and $\{\mathcal{N}_\chi = |\chi\rangle\langle\chi|\}$ are the rank-1 projectors in the energy eigenbases [18], and when ρ_{AB} is a correlated quantum state having thermal marginals, we find that $\mathcal{M}_1$ maps ρ_{AB} into a classically correlated state, diagonal in the energy eigenbasis. Moreover, it is readily seen that $\text{tr}_{B(A)}[\mathcal{M}_1[\rho_{AB}]] = \rho_{A(B)}$, and so the state $\mathcal{M}_1[\rho_{AB}]$ has the same thermal marginals as ρ_{AB} [19].

For this particular initial measurement, the probability $p(|\phi,\chi\rangle)$ of projecting into the state $|\phi,\chi\rangle$ under $\mathcal{M}_1$ can be written as

$$p(|\phi,\chi\rangle) \;=\; e^{-\beta_A E_\phi - \beta_B E_\chi - \log(Z_A Z_B) + \mathcal{I}[\rho_{AB}; M_\phi, N_\chi]}, \quad (7)$$

while a comparison with the probability of obtaining the $|\phi',\chi'\rangle_*$ outcome implies that

$$p(|\phi,\chi\rangle) \;=\; p(|\phi',\chi'\rangle_*)e^{\Delta\beta q + \beta_B\Delta\epsilon - \Delta\mathcal{I}(\gamma)}, \qquad (8)$$

where $\Delta\beta = \beta_A - \beta_B$, and crucially $\Delta\mathcal{I}(\gamma) = \mathcal{I}[\rho_{AB}; M_{\phi'_*}, N_{\chi'_*}] - \mathcal{I}[\rho_{AB}; M_\phi, N_\chi]$ is the appropriate correlation measure, dependent only on the initial state ρ_{AB} and the initial measurement $\mathcal{M}_1$.

Combining (8) with (5) we find that

$$\frac{\text{Prob}[\gamma]}{\text{Prob}[\gamma^*]} \;=\; e^{\Delta\beta q + \beta_B\Delta\epsilon - \Delta\mathcal{I}(\gamma)}, \qquad (9)$$

where γ^* is the time-reversed twin of γ given by

$$\gamma^* \equiv (\rho_{AB}; |\phi',\chi'\rangle_* \xrightarrow{U} |\phi,\chi\rangle_*). \qquad (10)$$

In particular, the history γ involves a quantity of energy q being transferred into A and a net increase of total energy $\Delta\epsilon$, while γ^* involves the opposite changes, and so $\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)^* = \Gamma(-q,-\Delta\epsilon)$. We also note that (9) is independent of the specific form of the dynamics (beyond time-reversal invariance), and depends solely on the properties of the initial quantum state ρ_{AB}.

One can now compare the ratio of probabilities of the set $\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)$ and its time-reversed twin set $\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)^* = \Gamma(-q,-\Delta\epsilon)$. The probability of the former is given by

$$\text{Prob}[\Gamma[\text{q},\Delta\epsilon]] \;= \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)} e^{\Delta\beta q + \beta_B\Delta\epsilon - \Delta\mathcal{I}(\gamma)}\text{Prob}[\gamma^*]. \quad (11)$$

While the term $e^{\Delta\beta q + \beta_B\Delta\epsilon}$ may be factored out of the sum, the correlation term cannot as it will generally vary over the set $\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)$. Instead we necessarily obtain bounds for the ratio of the probabilities. To fix the lower and upper bounds, we respectively define $\Delta\mathcal{I}_l = \max_{\gamma\in\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)}[\Delta\mathcal{I}(\gamma)]$ and $\Delta\mathcal{I}_u = \min_{\gamma\in\Gamma(q,\Delta\epsilon)}[\Delta\mathcal{I}(\gamma)]$, and immediately deduce that

$$e^{\Delta\beta q + \beta_B\Delta\epsilon - \Delta\mathcal{I}_l} \le \frac{\text{Prob}[\text{q},\Delta\epsilon]}{\text{Prob}[-\text{q},-\Delta\epsilon]} \le e^{\Delta\beta q + \beta_B\Delta\epsilon - \Delta\mathcal{I}_u}. \quad (12)$$

Equation (12) is a generalization of (2) and is a constraint on the relative likelihood of a forward transition to a backward transition given an initially correlated quantum state with thermal subsystems. As can be seen, by increasing the degree of correlations present in the initial state one gradually weakens the constraint on the thermodynamic arrow, as expected. Moreover, it is not possible to tighten these bounds without making additional assumptions as to the particular form of the dynamics.

Beyond the relative likelihood of the forward and reverse processes, one can take (9) and sum over $\gamma \in \Gamma$, to obtain the non-equilibrium equality for an initially correlated state

$$\langle e^{-\Delta\beta q - \beta_B\Delta\epsilon + \Delta\mathcal{I}}\rangle = 1 \qquad (13)$$

and then using Jensen's inequality we have that

$$\Delta\beta\langle q\rangle + \beta_B\langle\Delta\epsilon\rangle - \langle\Delta\mathcal{I}\rangle \ge 0. \qquad (14)$$

Here, $\langle\Delta\mathcal{I}\rangle$ represents the difference in the classical mutual information of measurement outcomes between the initial and final states.

Given the assumption that $\langle \Delta\epsilon \rangle = 0$ we have $\Delta\beta\langle q \rangle - \langle \Delta\mathcal{I} \rangle \geq 0$, which reduces to the Clausius relation $Q(1/T_A - 1/T_B) \geq 0$ for $Q = \langle q \rangle$ and the assumption of molecular chaos. More importantly it displays the energetic value of correlations in providing a modified lower bound of $Q(1/T_A - 1/T_B) \geq \langle \Delta\mathcal{I} \rangle$ with the function $\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}; M_i, N_j)$ as the appropriate sharp-outcome measure for the initial bipartite quantum state. This must be compared with averaged results obtained previously [8, 9] in which $\langle \Delta\mathcal{I} \rangle$ is replaced with the change in the quantum mutual information of the state ρ_{AB}. The origin of the difference is that the XFT demands sharp energies at the initial and final stages, as opposed to bluntly looking at expectation values of energy for pure quantum states.

While it is natural to impose energy conservation, either at the level of commuting Hamiltonians or expectation values, the XFT given by equation (12) makes predictions for a particular type of state with local temperatures and global correlations, and provides only the relative likelihood of seeing one forward thermodynamic process compared to its reverse - not whether it occurs at all. As such, the specific interaction Hamiltonian that is used only serves to predict the absolute likelihood of these different processes.

Beyond sharp energy measurements. As mentioned, the sharp energy measurements $\mathcal{M}_1$ used are quite destructive of coherence, and so one might wonder whether an XFT can be obtained for more gentle POVMs. In other words, can we perform the time-reverse pairing trick using mixed quantum states?

Given a preparation of some σ_{AB} by the initial measurement $\mathcal{M}_1$, we wish to do the pairing trick with the state σ_{AB} and a time-reversed twin. If we drop the assumption that $\mathcal{M}_2$ is a sharp energy measurement, but leave it unspecified as $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{M^{(2)}_{\phi'} \otimes N^{(2)}_{\chi'}\}$ we then require a generalization of (5). Using the time-reversal invariance of the unitary interaction we have $\mathrm{tr}[M^{(2)}_{\phi'} \otimes N^{(2)}_{\chi'} U\sigma_{AB}U^\dagger] = \mathrm{tr}[(\Theta\sigma_{AB}\Theta^\dagger)U\Theta M^{(2)}_{\phi'} \otimes N^{(2)}_{\chi'}\Theta^\dagger U^\dagger]$, and from this we see that, for the pairing trick to work, the POVM elements of $\mathcal{M}_2$ must *themselves be valid quantum states* of the same form prepared by $\mathcal{M}_1$ and the set of elements should be closed under the time-reversal operator Θ. This on its own is a highly restrictive condition, and explains why forming a theorem for more general POVMs than the projective case is difficult.

Application to semi-classical maximum work theorem. The above results, and in particular (14) find simple application in a semi-classical maximum work theorem scenario [13] in which a quantity of ordered energy is extracted from a primary quantum subsystem A. The primary system is free to dump entropy in the form of heat into a heat sink B, with fast relaxation times, and exchange mechanical work with a third (classical) adiabatic system C.

On the assumption of conservation of energy for the composite system ABC and the adiabaticity of C the averaged relation (14) leads to

$$dW_C \leq -dU_A + T_B dS_A - T_B\langle d\mathcal{I} \rangle \tag{15}$$

where $T_A dS_A := \langle dq \rangle$ corresponds heat flowing into A, and we assume for simplicity that no net work is done on A. The main point of this application is to display the contribution that the initial correlations between the primary subsystem and the reversible heat sink provide to the usual maximum work theorem, and in the process illustrate the well-known energetic value of correlations [14–17].

Conclusion. We have extended the Jarzynski-Wójcik Exchange Fluctuation Theorem to the situation where we drop the assumption of molecular chaos, and allow correlations to exist in the composite state. These correlations results in a modification of the XFT relation and can enhance the probability of heat flowing in the backward direction. We have applied our results to deriving a semi-classical maximum work theorem for correlated systems. Our work highlights the difficulty of obtaining further results for situations without initial and final measurements of energy.

Acknowledgments

D.J. is supported by the Royal Commission for the Exhibition of 1851. T.R. is supported by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council. Y. H. is supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for Young Scientists. S. N. and M. M. are supported by Project for Developing Innovation Systems of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan.

[1] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** 2690, (1997).
[2] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. E **56** 5018, (1997).
[3] G. Crooks, J. Stat. Phys. **90** 1481, (1998).
[4] C. Jarzynski and D. K. Wójcik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 230602 (2004).
[5] H. Price, *Time's Arrow and Archimedes' Point*, Oxford University Press (1996).
[6] H. D. Zeh, *The Physical Basis of The Direction of Time*, Springer 4th Ed. (2001).
[7] L. Boltzmann, *Lectures on Gas Theory*, Dover, (2011).
[8] M. H. Partovi, Phys. Rev. E **77**, 021110, (2008).
[9] D. Jennings and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. E , **81**, 061130, (2010).
[10] S. Popescu and A. Short and A. Winter, Nature Physics **2** 754 (2006).
[11] F. G. S. L. Brandão and M. Plenio, Nature Physics **4**, 873, (2008).
[12] F. G. S. L. Brandão and M. Horodecki and J. Oppenheim,

and J. M. Renes and R. W. Spekkens, arXiv:1111.3882 (2011).

[13] H. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, Wiley 2nd ed., (1985).

[14] L. Szilard, *Z. f. Physik* **53** 840-856 (1929)

[15] C. H. Bennett, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21** 905-940 (1982)

[16] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080403 (2008).

[17] S. Jevtic and D. Jennings and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110403 (2012)

[18] The function $\mathcal{I}$ may be related to the classical relative entropy of the joint measurement outcomes through the relation $I_c(\mathcal{M}:\mathcal{N}) = \sum_{i,j} \mathrm{tr}[M_i \otimes N_j \rho_{AB}]\mathcal{I}(\rho_{AB}; M_i, N_j)$.

[19] In addition, we have that $I_c(\mathcal{M}:\mathcal{N}) = I[\mathcal{M}_1[\rho_{AB}]; A : B]$ where $I[\sigma_{AB}; A : B]$ is the quantum mutual information of the bipartite state σ_{AB}, defined as $I[\sigma_{AB}; A : B] = S[\sigma_A] + S[\sigma_B] - S[\sigma_{AB}]$.